| 1                               |  |  |
|---------------------------------|--|--|
| 2                               |  |  |
| 3                               |  |  |
| 4                               |  |  |
| 5                               |  |  |
| 6                               |  |  |
| 7                               |  |  |
| 8<br>9<br>10                    | UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON AT TACOMA                              |  |
| 11                              | JAMES A. BATTLE Jr.,   |  |
| 12                              | Plaintiff,   | CASE NO. C10-5410 RJB                            |
| 13                              | v.   | ORDER DIRECTING PLAINTIFF<br>TO SHOW CAUSE       |
| 14                              | TUKWILLA POLICE CHIEF HAYNES et al.,   |  |
| 15<br>16                        | Defendant.   |  |
| 17                              | This 42 U.S.C. § 1983 Civil Rights action  | has been referred to the undersigned             |
| 18                              | Magistrate Judge pursuant to Title 28 U.S.C. §§ 636(b)(1)(A) and (B) and Local Magistrate          |  |
| 19   20                         | Judges' Rules MJR 1, MJR 3, and MJR 4. The Court, having reviewed plaintiff's application to       |  |
| 21                              | proceed in forma paupers, and the proposed complaint, does hereby find and ORDER the               |  |
| 22                              | following:   |  |
| 23                              | (l) Plaintiff informs the court that he has filed five prior actions where he proceeded            |  |
| 24                              | in forma pauperis. He discloses one of the cases was filed in the United States District Court for |  |
| <ul><li>25</li><li>26</li></ul> | the Eastern District of Washington, 09-CV-201JL.   | . Review of this court's records shows plaintiff |

has in fact filed to proceed in forma pauperis on eight occasions in this court alone and that several of those actions are currently pending:

- 1. <u>Battle v. State of Washington</u>, 05-cv-1365TSZ.
- 2. Battle v. Dept. of Corrections, 05-cv-1541JLR.
- 3. Battle v. Wick et al, 05-cv-2045RSL/MJB
- 4. Battle v. Wick et al, 08-cv-0642RAJ (motion for cert. pending).
- 5. Battle v. Travel Lodge Motel et al, 09-cv-0818RAJ/BAT (pending).
- 6. <u>Battle v. Vail et al</u>, 10-cv-0343RSL (pending).
- 7. <u>Battle v. Vail et al</u>, 10-cv- 5205RBL/KLS (pending).
- 8. <u>Battle v. Haynes</u>, 10-cv-5410RJB/JRC (pending).

When the court includes the case filed in the Eastern District the number of cases filed by plaintiff is nine -- not five. Further, review of the proposed complaint in this action shows plaintiff to be raising the same fact pattern and allegations as he has currently pending before the court in Battle v. Travel Lodge Motel et al, 09-cv-0818RAJ/BAT.

In this action plaintiff challenges the actions of Tukwila Police Officers in stopping and searching him. He raises allegations concerning the same conduct in <u>Battle v. Travel Lodge</u> <u>Motel et al.</u>, 09-cv-0818RAJ/BAT and names the city of Tukwila as a defendant. The court is concerned plaintiff is abusing the in forma pauperis statue. The court reaches this conclusion based on the failure of plaintiff to disclose all prior litigation, the number of open actions where plaintiff is proceeding in forma pauperis, and the repetitive nature of the claims in this action. A district court has wide discretion in deciding whether to grant an inmate the privilege of proceeding in forma pauperis and the court may consider prior filings. <u>O'Loughlin v. John Doe</u>, 920 F2d. 614 (9th Cir. 1990).

Plaintiff is ORDERED TO SHOW CAUSE on or before July 30, 2010, why the court should not recommend the application to proceed in forma pauperis be denied based on his failure to disclose all prior litigation, the number of open actions where plaintiff is proceeding in forma pauperis, and the repetitive nature of the action in this case. Plaintiff will need to specifically inform the court why the allegations in this action are were not raised in <a href="Battle v. Travel Lodge Motel et al">Battle v.</a>.

Travel Lodge Motel et al, 09-cv-0818RAJ/BAT.

The Clerk is directed to send copies of this Order and the General Order to plaintiff.

DATED this 28th day of June, 2010.

J. Richard Creatura

United States Magistrate Judge